DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 027 CS 204 315

AUTHOR Palmer, Mack R.
TITLE Journalism and the Educational Views of Alexander Meiklejohn.
PUB DATE Aug 78
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (61st, Seattle, Washington, August 13-16, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Citizen Participation; *Democratic Values; Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Principles; Educational Problems; Educational Trends; Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; *Liberal Arts; Public Affairs Education; *Social Responsibility
IDENTIFIERS Dewey (John); *Meiklejohn (Alexander); Pragmatism

ABSTRACT

Alexander Meiklejohn, who died in 1964 at the age of 92, was a constitutional scholar whose major interest was education. Among Meiklejohn's beliefs were the following: the social good should take precedence over individual achievement; the liberal arts college is the institution best suited to carry out an affirmative reading of the First Amendment; Congress should provide for the intellectual and cultural education of all citizens; education must not ignore vocational concerns; there should be "education in followership" for the citizenry, as well as education for leadership; citizens should keep informed about government policies; and individualism must be balanced with dedication to common purpose. Meiklejohn engaged in vociferous criticism of John Dewey and the tenets of pragmatism, finding pragmatism objectionable in its assignation of superiority to observed fact over pondered value; he also fought against the isolation of individual scholarly disciplines, believing that research results must be put into interdisciplinary perspective. Current trends that would disturb Meiklejohn include increasing professorial dedication to research in isolated fields, a decline in sharing among disciplines, and a decline in liberal studies with regard to an education for democracy. (GW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED161027

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Qualitative Studies Division

JOURNALISM AND THE EDUCATIONAL VIEWS OF ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mack R. Palmer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

By

Mack R. Palmer
Associate Professor

School of Journalism and Mass Communications
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
(405) 325-5122

Presented to the Qualitative Studies Division, Association for Education in Journalism Annual Convention, Seattle, Washington, August, 1978.

CS204 3/5

With due credit to Voltaire's comment on God, let it be said that if there were not now a qualitative studies division at AEJ, it would be necessary for the likes of the late Alexander Meiklejohn to invent one. Meiklejohn's belief in educational breadth, stretched by classical Western thought and vital to those who seek to understand in order to be understood, seems in accord with the objectives of a newcomer to the AEJ organization chart. This paper offers a somewhat heuristic sampling of the views of a Constitutional scholar who never quit being a teacher. It is hoped that whatever answers are neglected herein do not detract from the significance of the underlying questions.

Contrary to the assigned topic, a detailed analysis of Meiklejohn's educational views vis-a-vis journalism is not offered. To define journalism is beyond the intent of this effort and even if that task could be satisfactorily accomplished, Meiklejohn's treatment of journalism, whatever its dimensions, was minimal in his writings and speeches. What will attempt to suffice, however, is Meiklejohn on education and not limited to journalism by any means. In the exploration of his educational delights and disappointments, what he may have expected from journalism, and those who teach it, might also be detected.

Most journalism educators will identify Meiklejohn with freedom of expression, and justifiably so. But leading up to his intensive and vigorous Constitutional debate that coincided with the excesses of the McCarthy era, and again in the final months of his life, education was his major interest. This led him to view the First Amendment as an instructional implement and he would find its fundamental value more in the dissemination than in derivation of truth. The time-worn controversy between "Chi Squares" and "Green Eyeshades" would have found him denouncing both. Specialization and vocationalism are both mandatory in our society, he conceded, but narrowness of the former and weariness from the latter both seemed to him to interfere with the scope and span of attention necessary for effective citizenship.

For quite some time now this writer has engaged in a dissertational examination of Meiklejohn of First Amendment fame. It has long since become apparent that the key to understanding him is the key to the schoolhouse door. Two statements need now be made in that regard.

The first is this writer's conviction that Alexander Meiklejohn conceived the First Amendment in terms of education; he believed it was written to serve that particular "student body" introduced in the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States. Thinking such, his concern with and defense of the American press in its institutionalized sense, or journalism as its product, proved surprisingly modest.

In understanding Meiklejohn's contribution, it helps to sort and separate his First Amendment devotion to almost entirely unfettered expression from the more fundamental justification behind his insistence upon freedom. Meiklejohn was no mystic, but at times he sounded so, in extolling virtue of spirit over desire, and in championing an internal good waging a losing fight against external self-interest. A basic message of his writings up to the eve of World War II was the loss Americans had suffered by fragmentation into individual, independent, free agents, overly-competitive and at loss to find any common purpose beyond self-satisfaction. He faulted capitalism, John Locke, John Dewey and the trend of American education for that melancholy state of affairs and decried American devotion to democracy in the world conflict that followed because it sought tactical superiority on competitive grounds rather than striving to intellectually convert its dictatorial adversaries.

Because the home province of Meiklejohn was thought, he remained comfortable with the abstract, championed theory, and would have welcomed the recent headline, "Teaching Thinking - Renaissance of 19th Century Belief."[1] Meiklejohn placed the kind of importance in thought that Richard Bernstein recently echoed, reviewing the late Hannah Arendt's contribution to the subject in her posthumous The Life of the Mind. Bernstein described thinking as "the soundless dialogue that we carry on with ourselves in solitude. It does not directly yield knowledge as the sciences do, nor does it directly result in practical wisdom."[2] Better still, Arendt's own words:

> The manifestation of the wind of thought is not knowledge; it is the ability to tell right from wrong, beautiful from ugly. And this at rare moments, when the stakes are on the table, may indeed prevent catastrophies, at least for the self.[3]

Where Meiklejohn would have been uncomfortable with Arendt is her accent on self. He consistently described commitment in terms of community, and whatever individual contribution education made in terms of personal choice or conduct, was in order that the person then contribute input to society in its search for " the ability to tell right from wrong,

beautiful from ugly." Meiklejohn defined democracy as "society carrying on an enterprise in which all its members have a genuine share,"[4] and he refined the description by declaring democracy "a society which has only one set of schools."[5] Looking backward, Meiklejohn was referring to the double-standard of John Locke, whom he saw as an aristocrat in egalitarian clothing, willing to distinguish between education of the rich and the poor. Locke's regretable legacy to America, in Meiklejohn's opinion, was competitive emphasis in which individual achievement outdistanced social good, a trait revealed by industrialism and finally challenged during the misery of the depression. The libertarian impact on education was equally adverse, he believed, and therein sided with another well-known educator's complaint that the university creates an atmosphere "not unfavorable to the pursuit of knowledge, which we now see as the path to power and prosperity, but it is hostile to the pursuit of understanding and wisdom."[6] Robert M. Hutchins expressed those views after Meiklejohn's death, but they simply reiterated his despair over the passing of the liberal college with its tradition of understanding existing knowledge rather than deriving more.

Meiklejohn, to today's audience, is likely known more for his defense of free speech, (a semantical misconception he long tried to correct) than in terms of his educational emphasis. But the importance of the latter served not only as a rudder during his Constitutional cruising, it also was the closing subject of his prolonged critique of American society. The pressing urgencies of freedom following World War II sidetracked him for a quarter of a century but at his death at 92 in 1964 he was writing a book on The American Liberal College. His description of it as "a place of the mind" verified Scott Buchanan's eulogistic explanation that Meiklejohn believed the liberal college, and not the university, to be "the institution above all others, that could carry out the affirmative or positive reading of the First Amendment.[7]

In linking college and Constitution, Buchanan summarized Meiklejohn's belief that people were obligated to learn in order to be free. This in turn suggested that the people, collectively as the state, desired and required education for democracy and that such an education must come by way of a positive reading of the First Amendment.

The command that government was not to abridge freedom of speech or press was inadequate for self-governance. The passage of time and growth of complexity demanded that

governmental self- restraint make way for a revised, positive obligation. In terms of individual and aggregate duty, Meiklejohn declared an obligation for the person and the people to think right. Thinking right translated in the kind of thinking which must be done if people are to live together in a free society. Since "freedom depends on intelligence," Meiklejohn's logic established that "intelligence is therefore a duty."[8] In terms of the state, the duty existed also. Thus, on educational grounds, Meiklejohn proposed for his cherished First Amendment, this addition:

> In view of the intellectual and cultural responsibilities laid upon the citizens of a free society by the political institutions of self-government, The Congress, acting in cooperation with the several states and with non-governmental organizations serving the same general purpose, shall have power to provide for the intellectual and cultural education of all the citizens of the United States.[9]

The balance of this paper will consider the mission Meiklejohn assigned to education, shaped by his single-minded perception of its indispensability to democracy, and in brief conclusion what this recommended to journalism in a generic sense.

Meiklejohn had a penchant for duality and dichotomy. His separation of public and private speech by use of First and Fifth Amendment wording which he believed significantly contrasted "freedom" and "liberty" is a notable example of the latter. In terms of duality he saw individuals simultaneously serving as the rulers and the ruled, as worker and citizen, as assimilator of facts and conservator of values. Thus education must not ignore material concerns, even in the face of Meiklejohn's undisguised preference for matters of citizenship. Both were necessary in America.

> A democracy lays two requirements upon its citizens. First, each of them is rightly expected to practice a vocation. As cobbler or lawyer, as plumber, artist, or homemaker, he must produce his share of goods and services. To enjoy the fruits of other men's labor without making a fair return by one's own is to violate the justice and generosity upon which the whole structure of democracy rests.
>
> But democracy lays requirements also upon the general intelligence of its citizens. They are called upon to understand and appreciate what the community, as a whole, cares about, what it does. Unless they do this the program of free self-government is unworkable. Government by consent of the governed becomes a silly and lying pretense just insofar as any member of the community does not understand the actions which are taken, does not share in the taking of them.[10]

Meiklejohn placed great importance on the vocational side of a citizen because he believed "inevitably we become what we chiefly do."[11] He credited Epictetus with the

insight that "to admire or despise a man is necessarily to see him in relation to some enterprise which he has undertaken to carry on."[12] He carried the idea into a social context, by declaring that "the judgment of what a man is, is an assessment of his attitude toward the total enterprise of his people."[13] The two worlds of the individual cannot be separated, their educational preparation must consider both civic and career needs, and their obligation to society resides in both types of endeavor.

> We Americans are determined that there shall not be in our society two kinds of people. We will not have two kinds of schools--one for gentlemen and ladies the other for workers and servants. We believe that every man and woman should be a "worker." We believe that every man and woman should be "cultivated." We believe that all men and women should govern. We believe that all men and women should be governed.[14]

Unfortunately, in Meiklejohn's assigned duality of the individual, the labors of Mr. Hyde frequently eliminated Jekyllian duty to citizenship. He was well aware that the tedium of the workday smothered the spark of individual civic interest and this awareness fed his criticism of the price the assembly line extracted from human freedom.

Another question confronting Meiklejohn, and by extension the educational process he advocated, was how to accommodate a society in which its human components were simultaneously ruler and ruled, governor and governed, citizen and subject, leader and follower. Education, he insisted, must prepare each to the best of his ability to meet the varied responsibilities. All were expected to be involved, but were identical preparations necessary for the leader and the led? Meiklejohn answered that "the citizenry needs education in followership: how to follow freely and thereby maintain free leadership."[15] And having called for "education in followership," he turned his attention to education for leadership, because after all, in a self-governing society participation implies leadership. He became interested in President John F. Kennedy, raising questions about how well his education had served a national leader and what improvements might have been made. A Harvard professor responded:

> As Jack's tutor and guide for two and a half years I have one idea. Jack needed a process of accelerated maturing. He had been a sickly, shy boy. I am glad to say that with my help he was able to spend the second half of his junior year in Europe. . .When he returned in 1939, he was an experienced young man with a fine grip on the materials that went into his Honors thesis.
>
> Jack was lucky. No one knew what was in store for him; he might have been

ruined in the academic scramble to be Aristotle on the log. We cannot read the book of Fate, thank God![16]

Everyone would not become president of the United States but education must fit everyone to capably and intelligently choose who does. That was reason enough for Meiklejohn to insist upon quality in the "thinking power of a democracy." His "qualitative studies," so to speak, at a minimum prepared the citizenry for intelligent debate. To borrow the words of Lord Balfour, Meiklejohn presupposed "a people so fundamentally at one they could afford to bicker."[17]

The better informed the people, the better their bickering and to the extent knowledge was impaired, Meiklejohn believed participation suffered. "Complete ignorance means complete passivity," he declared. "Partial knowledge means ill-directed action. Confused knowledge means conflicting plans of action."[18]

The price of such conflicting plans had been described years earlier by G.K. Chesterton. "Modern society is intrinsically insecure," he noted, "because it is based on the notion that men will do the same thing for different reasons."[19] Meiklejohn's anxiety about a functionally self-governing society comprised of persons employing informational fragments for the task was of similar concern. Although he recognized the necessity for education to prepare individuals for the diverse jobs in industrialized society, he stressed adamantly the need for education also to provide a common body of knowledge for those engaged in the common purpose. He saw the function of the mind as "striving for unity" and took issue with John Dewey's characterization of thought as mere problem solving. Reducing the mind to a "trouble shooter" was, in Meiklejohn's opinion, to belittle the capacity of human intelligence to grasp and unify details rather than be confined to the limited perspective of pragmatic instrumentalism.

"No better basis for the understanding of liberal education has ever been offered than the statement that governments derive 'their just powers from the consent of the governed,'" Meiklejohn wrote in 1944. And he believed the crucial word in the Preamble was "consent." "No one can give or refuse consent to a policy unless he understands what the policy is."[20]

"Informed" consent is what Meiklejohn meant, and his awareness of its absence is not less relevant today than when he so cogently voiced it. Is higher education today providing the cohesion and commonality necessary for informed consent, and if not, what contribution is to be made by journalism as a calling.? The answer to the first question is "no", and

evidence of this comes from a recent stirring of interest in returning to a central core of knowledge. Harvard University's new goal suffices as representative and commendable. A return to a core curriculum is intended so that Harvard graduates will possess "basic literacy in major forms of intellectual discourse."[21] Stimulus for the objective came two years ago when the arts and sciences dean sought faculty advice in restoring "the possibility of common discourse among educated people."[22]

Recognizing that the trend toward individualism had gone too far, the Harvard academicians are now engaged in a conscious attempt to balance individualism with common purpose. It is an endeavor that Meiklejohn would applaud. The problem, as Meiklejohn had identified years earlier, is what President John Ward of Amherst College[23] calls "the absence of any shared educational purpose" in liberal arts programs. His sentiments were echoed by Ernest Boyer, United States Commissioner of Education, who declared that " a college curriculum that suggests that students have nothing in common is just as flawed as one that suggests that all students are alike."[23]

The problem centers on co-existence of the need for knowledge to be not only derived but understood. Generally speaking, derivation of new knowledge demands that awareness and comprehension of previous information serve as a starting point. As Syracuse Professor Maxwell McCombs has written in defense of a creative approach to research, "scholars are compilers of what is already known."[25] Yet the fact remains that no matter how closely the functions of teaching and scholarship are intertwined, research is self-limiting. It understandably and inherently emerges from specialization and specialization encumbers community, not withstanding the fact that the essence of effective research is combining evidence into a measurable end product. Research assembles and organizes in a painstaking, incremental quest for significance. To the degree that it disciplines habits of thought and inquiry, its influence upon instruction is commendable. But research is by its nature limited and limiting, even in a multi-disciplinary areas. The educator committed to research voluntarily builds his own fence.

Meiklejohn engaged in a lengthy, sometimes vociferous criticism of John Dewey and the tenets of pragmatism, especially its assigned superiority to observed fact over pondered value. He bitterly resented what he called "the war cries of pragmatism" that inveighed against fixed beliefs and called for an end to useless knowledge. Not that the tactic wasn't success-

ful, and deservedly so, against Victorian stagnation and inequality, but in putting an end to the outmoded residue of an era long gone, the pragmatists carried the attack too far into the neutral province of the mind. Facts yes, but facts tempered by wisdom, by concerned thought about their contribution to the common good, these were the requirements Meiklejohn imposes. And he recognized that the burden of proof worked against him. "The findings of the sciences are tested and verified. They are warranted by evidence. But the judgments of wisdom, the choices of value, have no such warrant in evidence."[26] Experience neither explains nor interprets, Meiklejohn reminded, and to stake one's all on the outcome or observation of experience, without more, is folly.

In an exchange of views with Dewey in Fortune Magazine, Meiklejohn observed that "it is one thing to know 'how to do.' It is a wholly different, though related, thing to know 'what to do.'"[27] "Fact finders," Meiklejohn added, "are more sorely tempted to ignore values than are the value seekers to ignore facts."[28] Empiricism met with two objections from Meiklejohn--its tendency to narrow perspective and its slavish adherence to the neutrality of facts.

Instinctly, Meiklejohn fought the self-imposed fences of research. A feature of the Experimental College he headed at the University of Wisconsin was faculty encouragement not only to peer into one another's scholastic domain, but to willingly and competently trespass. Each teacher had assigned subjects but also was expected to apply his expertise to other disciplines by frequent exchange of classes. Such is not common in higher education, Meiklejohn later noted:

> Our faculties are. . .active, industrious and creative in the separate fields of knowledge. But the members have no common mind. . . They compete and compromise. And the fruit of this free play of the forces of the mental marketplace is here, as elsewhere, poverty in the midst of plenty. A poverty of wisdom comes from an abundance of knowledge.[29]

The concern Meiklejohn was expressing assumes added significance from this Public Relations Journal footnote on abundance:

> By 2032, if current trends continue, the total body of scientific information will be ninety six times what it is today. Recorded knowledge in the form of technical reports, siminar proceedings, trade journals, documents, and books, is increasing at the rate of 500,000 pages a minute.[30]

Add to that, the unincluded documentation coming at a more modest but conspicu-

ous rate from the humanities, and it can be seen why Meiklejohn would complain that the competition of scholarship, in quantitative consequence, has put an end to government by the people. The essential defect of a competitive society, " he wrote, "is that common people cannot make the decisions which are needed. They cannot understand what is going on."[31] But the alternative, reliance upon what he called the "aristocracy of brains," also meets with failure on occasion, and with tragic results. Meiklejohn declared so in the failure of experts to end the depression of the 1930s. He might well make similar comments today regarding the gordian knots of inflation and energy problems.

The message that Meiklejohn conveyed to all who would listen, and in particular he meant it for the educational community, was that there awaited for use a repository of unverified wisdom that a specialist society was foolish to ignore. Asking a question of his era to himself, he wrote:

> "Are you," it will be asked, "recommending for an Age of Science forms and methods of thinking which men used in the ancient days before Science had been created? And to this, if my courage will sustain me, I must answer with a plain 'Yes.'"[32]

Neither Socrates nor Christ, he argued, were scientific in their respective approaches to the fundamental demands of intelligence and humanity. "In the scientific sense, their results remain, and must forever remain, 'unverified' and 'unvalidated,'" Meiklejohn admitted. And yet, he added, "they were thinkers."[33]

Following in their footsteps, said Meiklejohn, were the likes of Veblen, Dewey, Whitehead and Holmes. "No one of them has been a discoverer of new information. I doubt if any one of them has added a single important fact to our store of knowledge."[34]

Such individuals, Meiklejohn seemed to infer, are rarely sought or found on the campus of higher education today. And as a consequence, the plethora of information no longer is being put, if indeed it could be, into adequate interdisciplinary perspective. The "information explosion" continues to be heard and felt. In the form of published research alone, scholarly hay is being stacked in such quantity and with such speed as to justify the concern of an Eliot[35] or a Meiklejohn that needles of usable truth are being irretrievably buried. Joseph Schwab, described in the Center Magazine as "one of the great teachers at the University of Chicago," sees this as consequence:

> One thing has happened on the collegiate level in the last forty years that has affected teaching dangerously and made it infinitely worse than it was. It is the almost total transference of the professor's loyalty and sense of belonging from the institution that employs him to the learned society.

> The learned society is loose, and it must be communicated within its own language at a distance. That means that research and scholarship become of paramount importance to the professor.[36]

In the trend away from the type of liberal studies he so fiercely defended and in the professorial dedication to a professional community rather than the surrounding academic one, Meiklejohn would see a double loss. He would see further decline in the ability of colleagues within the institution to share either commitment or content. Some evidence of this trend, and confusion engendered, is reflected in a report in which leading journalism researchers ranked stimulation and encouragement from colleagues as 12th among 16 factors related to research productivity, while administrators of leading schools in media research ranked the same factor as third.[37]

But of greater potential loss, Meiklejohn would assert, is the cost of the decline of liberal studies in terms of the citizenship he held so important. Let a contemporary observer, restate Meiklejohn's complaint.

> The most important consequence of the death of the liberal arts is a dulling of our collective political sense and a consequent loss of cultural idealism. It is a good rule of thumb to assume a rather direct correspondence between the quality of education and the quality of political life. The concept of excellence that prevails in the one will prevail in the other. Conversely to abandon the task of educating liberally is to abandon the principle means at our disposal for forming an educated citizenry.[38]

To the extent that these criticisms voiced earlier by Meiklejohn and continuing to the present are valid, what hope exists for the common man, caught up in a confused consensus based more on what the polls say others think than upon his own informed judgment? Harold Lasswell detected the problem 30 years ago, and in calling for an "equivalent enlightenment" to provide at least a small measure of common ground for layman, leader and expert alike, he suggested that the responsibility probably resided with mass media.[39]

What message then, would Meiklejohn have for media of this hour? As noted at the outset, his commentary on the press, as such, was limited and caustic. However, one finds insight concerning his expectations from journalism by examining his perception of the First Amendment. His conclusion seems addressed equally to today's specialist, whose truth is expressed in technical argot, and yesterday's political philosopher, who thought a marketplace of ideas yielded the fruit of truth.

The greatest of all man's achievements, that making all others possible, Meiklejohn

said, was the invention of the language. Without it, the bickering of a democratic society surely would be deadlier, for as Liane Norman recently wrote: "The act of addressing and being addressed by another holds out the hope that the essential community that permits discourse will survive particular antagonisms."[40] The principal contribution of the First Amendment, and hence from journalists, in this context, is seen in what some might find a startling interpretation by Meiklejohn. "The First Amendment is not, primarily, a device for the winning of new truth, though that is very important. It is a device for the sharing of whatever truth has been won."[41]

Years before, he had chastised the realists for their preoccupation with the reality of the moment. "We believe more in facts than in longing,"[42] he protested. Without ideals, without some connective tissue provided to students jointly by the teacher and the curriculum, and without an awareness that the divisiveness of today's age is more the product of technological specialism than pluralistic factionalism, education stands in danger of defaulting in its primary assignment-the education for democracy. To the extent that facts enjoy unquestioned supremacy over longings, the price may be high, even for a pragmatic society. It is a price that should be of great concern to advocates of qualitative study, and it is a price that Meiklejohn thought too high to pay. The late Hal Borland described it so aptly, although he substituted for longings, his synonym "legends."

"When the legends die," Borland wrote, "the dreams end. When the dreams end, there is no more greatness."[43]

NOTES

[1]New York Times, 25 June 1978.

[2]New York Times Book Review, 25 May 1978.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Alexander Meiklejohn, What Does America Mean? (New York: Norton and Company, 1935), p. 179.

[5]Meiklejohn, Education Between Two Worlds (New York: Harper & Bros., 1942), p. 31.

[6]Robert M. Hutchins, Center Magazine, May/June 1977, p. 82.

[7]"Education for Freedom," Alexander Meiklejohn with commentary by Scott Buchanan, Tape No 183, The Center for Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California.

[8]Meiklejohn, "The Crisis in American Institutions," Harris Lectures at Northwestern University, 1934, Lecture 5, p.3. The Alexander Meiklejohn Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison, Wisconsin, Box 35, Fol. 1. Hereinafter referred to as Papers.

[9]Harry Kalvin, Jr., "Sport and Law," Rights 12 (February 1965) :14

[10]Meiklejohn, "Elements of Democratic Education," p.3. Papers, box 35, fol 5.

[11]Meiklejohn, America , p. 243.

[12]Ibid., p. 44

[13]Meiklejohn, Education, p. 269.

[14]Ibid., p. 147

[15]Meiklejohn, Proposal for Adult Education Program. 1956. Papers, box 40, fol. 3.

[16]Prof. Bruce Hopper to Meiklejohn, 23 July 1964, Papers, box 17, fol. 2.

[17]Quoted in Henry M. Magid, "Freedom and Political Unity, Ethics 51 (January 1941) 144.

[18]Note 15, supra .

[19]G.K. Chesterton, "The Mad Hatter and the Sane Householder," Vanity Fair , January 1921, p. 54.

[20]Meiklejohn, "Required Education for Freedom," American Scholar 13 (Autumn 1944): 394.

[21] New York Times, 26 February 1978.

[22] Ibid.

[23] An earlier occupant of the presidential chair at Amherst was Meiklejohn, 1912-1923.

[24] New York Times, 12 March 1978.

[25] Maxwell E. McCombs, "Too Many Whack at Problems, Fail to Think Creatively." Journalism Educator, 29 (April 1974): 3.

[26] Meiklejohn, Education, p. 152.

[27] Meiklejohn, "A Reply ro John Dewey," Fortune, January 1945, p.212.

[28] Ibid., p. 214.

[29] Meiklejohn, "Elements of Democratic Education,: p. 3 Papers, box 35, fol. 3. Ca. 1944.

[30] Gerald S. Snyder, 1994 The World of Tomorrow (New York: U.S. News and World Report Book Div., 1973), p. 18. Quoted in Leonard J. Synder, "Controversy," Public Relations Journal 31 (June 1975): 26.

[31] Meiklejohn, America, p. 244.

[32] Ibid., p. 32.

[33] Ibid., p. 33

[34] Ibid., p. 28

[35] "Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge? Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?" T.S. Eliot, The Wasteland and Other Poems (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1934), p. 81.

[36] Joseph J. Schwab, "Teaching and Learning," Center Magazine. November/December 1976, p. 45.

[37] Richard Cole and Thomas Bowers, "An Exploration of Factors Related to Journalism Faculty Productivity," Journalism Quarterly 52 (Winter 1975) : 36.

[38] Bernard Murchland, "The Eclipse of Liberal Arts," Change 8 (November 1976) : 22.

[39] Harold D. Lasswell, "The Structure and Function of Communication in Society," in the Communicator of Ideas, Lyman Bryson (ed.), (New York, Harper and Row, 1948). pp.37-51.